

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR 2038-280 11/23/2001 Junji Shinohara 09/990,262

7590

08/02/2004

LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP Suite 310 1700 Diagonal Road Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

REICHLE, KARIN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3761

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | | F. |
|--|---|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| Advisory Action | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | | 09/990,262 | SHINOHARA ET AL. | - 1 |
| · | | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | | Karin M. Reichle | 3761 | - |
| The MAILING DATE of this co | mmunication app | ears on the cover sheet with the | correspondence addre | ess |
| THE REPLY FILED 02 July 2004 FAIL Therefore, further action by the applica final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may condition for allowance; (2) a timely file Examination (RCE) in compliance with | nt is required to a / <u>only</u> be either: (1 d Notice of Appea | void abandonment of this appli) a timely filed amendment wh | cation. A proper reply ich places the applicati | to a ion in |
| | PERIOD FOR R | EPLY [check either a) or b)] | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresr | | • | | |
| no event, however, will the statutory p ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN TH 706.07(f). | period for reply expire E FIRST REPLY WA | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set for later than SIX MONTHS from the mai S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF | ling date of the final rejection THE FINAL REJECTION. \$ | n. See MPEP |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under of fee have been filed is the date for purposes of defee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reptimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term | etermining the period the expiration date of ly received by the Off | of extension and the corresponding ar the shortened statutory period for rep ice later than three months after the m | nount of the fee. The appro ly originally set in the final C | priate extension Office action; or |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) wil | l not be entered b | ecause: | | |
| (a) X they raise new issues that w | ould require furth | er consideration and/or search | (see NOTE below); | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new i | matter (see Note | below); | | |
| (c) Ithey are not deemed to place issues for appeal; and/or | e the application | in better form for appeal by ma | terially reducing or sim | plifying the |
| (d) they present additional clair | ms without cancel | ling a corresponding number of | finally rejected claims | i. |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sh | <u>eet</u> . | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome t | the following rejec | ction(s): | | |
| Newly proposed or amended cla canceling the non-allowable clai | | l be allowable if submitted in a | separate, timely filed a | ımendment |
| 5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, c application in condition for allow | | | sidered but does NOT | place the |
| 6.☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT to raised by the Examiner in the fin | | cause it is not directed SOLELY | f to issues which were | newly |
| 7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b)□ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or v | vill be) as follows: | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>2-17</u> . | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on 6 | <u>)2 July 2004</u> is a)[| ☐ approved or b)⊠ disappro | oved by the Examiner. | |
| 9 Note the attached Information Di | isclosure Stateme | ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paner No(s) | | |

Karin M. Reichle Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3761

10. ☑ Other: With respect to the drawing corrections, see Note supra.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the proposed amendment raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search in that the proposed new independent claims, i.e. 15-17, no longer require front end portions of the transversely opposite sides being closer to the front waist region than the rear end portions yet include the limitations of dependent claims 15-17, respectively. The claims also no longer require the combinations of claims 3 and 6-14. Furthermore Applicants arguments with regard to Rajala are narrower than the prior art rejection set forth in the FINAL which relied on "portions already cited and claims" with regard to claims 15-17, not just col. 11, lines 26-62 of Rajala as argued, and thus col. 11, line 63-col. 12, line 46, and thereby col. 12, lines 18-24 which teach that the portion 48B is under substantially no elongation while the portions 48A and 48c are elongated up to about 300%, i.e. the tensile stress, i.e. the stretching or extension stress, of the portions 48A and C are greater than then that of 48B. Since the specification amendments making such commensurate with the proposed drawing changes have not been entered, the drawings are not approved. Applicants remarks bridging pages 17-18 have been noted but are deemed nonpersuasive because such are not commensurate with the claim language as originally filed nor as presently exists, e.g. the present claim language does not claim that certain portions of the elastic members do not extend in a circular arc whereas the original claims required the elastic members, not merely a particular portion thereof, extend in a circular arc. Note also, e.g., page 4, first full paragraph, and page 10, first two full paragraphs, as originally filed.